

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-2001-75297 in view of Norris et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,858,079). Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-33990 in view of Norris et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,858,079). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of the instant application recites "repeatedly purifying the organic semiconductor material to remove impurities . . ." These rejections admit that neither of the primary references thereof (i.e., neither JP-2001-75297 nor JP 2001-33990) disclose or suggest this feature. In fact, Norris et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature either. Instead, Norris et al. discloses purifying silica spheres, not an organic semiconductor material as claimed. Specifically, Norris et al. discloses a process comprising the step as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of purifying silica spheres. Accordingly, Norris et al. discloses the step of purifying silica spheres, not purifying a semiconductor material as claimed.

Further, Norris et al. relates to a method for forming planer opal templates made from silica spheres. That is, Norris refers to a photonic crystalline material. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Norris et al. is entirely different in technical field from the present invention. In fact, Norris et al. merely teaches that a material, which is used for infiltration within interstitial spaces between the silica spheres, may be an organic semiconductor (column 9, lines 42 to 46). Norris et al. neither teaches nor suggests that any organic semiconductor material should be repeatedly purified to expel impurities to achieve an impedance in the range of $-80^\circ \leq \theta \leq -90^\circ$ as recited in instant Claim 1. Thus, even if one skilled in the art were to consider Norris et al. it would not lead to Applicants' invention, either singly or in combination with the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the invention of Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, either singly or in combination. Since the remaining claims depend from Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that they are likewise patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 5, 2006

By: _____


Michael E. Hilton
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/jlk